



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/562,922

12/29/2005

Kinzo Kishida

P1211US

8584

1218

7590

09/29/2008

CASELLA & HESPOS
274 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10016

EXAMINER

NGHIEM, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2863

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/562,922	Applicant(s) KISHIDA ET AL.	
	Examiner MICHAEL P. NGHIEM	Art Unit 2863	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 10-16 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9 and 17-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12-29-05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the markings (clean version of specification, page 38, lines 13, 17) should be removed.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1 and 2, the phrase "or the like" (line 2) renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

The following limitations lack antecedent basis:

Art Unit: 2863

- claim 2, "which" (line 10); "the input" (line 11).
- claims 7, 8, "the substantially same point" (line 4).
- claims 10, 21, "the same point" (last line).
- claims 17, 18, "the substantially same point" (line 3).

The remaining claims are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 11, 12, 14-16, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Masazumi et al. (JP 2002-340741, see English Translation).

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Masazumi et al. discloses a structure monitor system (Fig. 1) for analyzing a distortion or a like physical quantity at a specified point of a structure (storage tank, Problem To Be Solved, lines 3-4; Fig. 1), in which the physical quantity at one point on a boundary of the structure (Solution, lines 1-5) or inside of the

Art Unit: 2863

structure (Solution, line 17) is expressed by a governing equation (paragraph 14), by a numerical analysis method by setting a specific boundary condition (paragraph 0014), and monitoring the structure based on the analysis result (paragraph 0014, lines 7-8), comprising:

a measuring means (7) for, using an optical fiber sensor (4, 5) laid on the boundary of the structure (Fig. 1), measuring physical quantities of the structure at points on the boundary of the structure where the optical fiber sensor is laid (Solution, lines 1-7),

a numerically analyzing means (8) for calculating the physical quantity at the specified point of the structure by the numerical analysis method using the measured physical quantities by the measuring means as the boundary condition (Solution, lines 7-17), and

a display means (9) for displaying information on the analyzed physical quantity by the numerical analyzing means in relation to the position of the structure (Figs. 2-3).

Regarding claim 2, Masazumi et al. further discloses the numerically analyzing means for deriving physical quantities at points on the boundary of the structure where the optical fiber sensor is not laid (estimated parameter, Solution, lines 9-12; predicted value, Solution, line 17), which physical quantities are converted for the input as the boundary condition (e.g., side plate periphery, paragraph 0014, lines 3-4), from the governing equation using the measured physical quantities by the measuring means (paragraph 0014), and calculating an analyzed physical quantity at a specified point of

Art Unit: 2863

the structure (e.g. calculating petroleum level height, paragraph 0014, line 1) by the numerical analysis method using at least either the derived physical quantities or the measured physical quantities on the boundary as the boundary condition (paragraph 0014).

Regarding claims 3 and 14, even though Masazumi et al. does not explicitly disclose a notifying means for giving a notification if the analyzed physical quantity by the numerically analyzing means exceeds a predetermined physical quantity, this is an optional limitation suggested by the “if” clause.

Regarding claims 4 and 15, Masazumi et al. discloses the optical fiber sensor is laid on the outer surface of the structure (Solution, lines 1-5).

Regarding claims 5 and 16, Masazumi et al. discloses the numerically analyzing means calculates the analyzed physical quantity using a boundary element method as the numerical analysis method (calculation using finite element method, paragraph 0014).

Regarding claims 11 and 22, Masazumi et al. discloses the optical fiber sensor also serves as the confirmation measuring means (optical fibers 4-6).

Art Unit: 2863

Regarding claims 12 and 23, Masazumi et al. discloses the display means is provided separately from the numerically analyzing means and is connected with the numerically analyzing means via a communication means (communication means between display 9 and computer of 8) for transmitting and receiving information (Fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 10, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masazumi et al..

Regarding claims 10 and 21, Masazumi et al. discloses the measuring means includes a confirmation measuring means (portion of optical fiber that is laid over structure, Solution, lines 1-5) laid at an arbitrary position of the structure for measuring physical quantities at points of the laid position of the confirmation measuring means (Solution, lines 1-5), the numerically analyzing means (8) calculates the analyzed physical quantities at the points where the physical quantity is measured by the confirmation measuring means (Solution, lines 7-17).

However, Masazumi et al. does not disclose:

- claims 3 and 14, a notifying means for giving a notification if the analyzed physical quantity by the numerically analyzing means exceeds a predetermined physical quantity.
- claims 10 and 21, the display means displays information on the comparison of the measured physical quantity and the analyzed physical quantity at the same point.

Nevertheless, Masazumi et al. discloses the numerically analyzing means being a computer (8). The computer has a display means (9). Masazumi et al. discloses the analyzed physical quantity by the numerically analyzing means exceeds a predetermined physical quantity (see angle of inclination, 23 degrees vs. 13 degrees, paragraph 0024). It is common knowledge to provide the computer with a notifying means such as an emailing means or a printing means for the purpose of reporting a test or analyzed data to a user.

Furthermore, Masazumi et al. discloses the comparison of the measured physical quantity and the analyzed physical quantity at the same point (paragraph 0014, lines 7-8). It would be obvious to use the display means (9) to convey a test or analyzed data to a user.

Art Unit: 2863

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a notifying means and displaying the result of comparison of the measured physical quantity and the analyzed physical quantity at the same point for the purpose of reporting/conveying test or analyzed data to a user.

Claims 13 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masazumi et al. in view of Jaeger et al. (US 4,650,281).

Masazumi et al. discloses the all of the claimed limitations as discussed above except the optical fiber sensor is coated with a magnetically distortable member that is deformed according to a magnetic force.

Nevertheless, Jaeger et al. discloses an optical fiber sensor is coated with a magnetically distortable member that is deformed according to a magnetic force (column 1, lines 10-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Masazumi et al. with the optical fiber sensor being coated with a magnetically distortable member as disclosed by Jaeger et al. for the purpose of improving the sensing capability of the optical sensors (column 1, lines 24-30).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-9 and 17-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Reasons For Allowance

The **combination** as claimed wherein a structure monitor system comprising the numerically analyzing means divides the structure into two areas partly overlapping each other; calculates physical quantities at points in an overlapping area of the two areas by a boundary element method while calculating an analyzed physical quantity at a point in one area; and calculates an analyzed physical quantity at a point in the other area by a finite element method using the analyzed physical quantities in the overlapping area (claims 6, 19) or comparing the assumed distortion and a measured distortion at the reference point and executing calculation according to an optimization method to identify the position and shape of the crack (claims 7, 17) or comparing the assumed temperature and a measured temperature at the reference point and executing calculation according to an optimization method to identify the position and shape of the abnormally high temperature part (claims 8, 18) or the numerically analyzing means calculates the analyzed physical quantity by approximating the boundary condition on an infinite boundary to zero in the case of analyzing a specified point in the structure having the infinite boundary sufficiently distant from the specified

Art Unit: 2863

point to be analyzed by the numerically analyzing means to make the boundary condition ignorable (claims 9, 20) is not disclosed, suggested, or made obvious by the prior art of record.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Nghiem whose telephone number is (571) 272-2277. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on (571) 272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Michael P. Nghiem/

Primary Examiner, GAU 2863

September 23, 2008